

2820 as alluding to some sort of rebellion in Egypt after Cleopatra's downfall, we are told that the papyrus fragment actually has no relevance to Gallus. Elsewhere, however, issues of potential significance (for example, the abrupt resignation of Messalla Corvinus as *praefectus urbi*) are merely alluded to in footnotes (p. 339). Little enlightenment is offered on some notorious problems, such as the identity of the conspirator Varro Murena: arguing that the identities of L. Licinius Varro Murena and A. Terentius Varro Murena can be resolved into one person by an adoption (p. 293) does not work onomastically.

The patient reader will uncover some useful perspectives, however, particularly in Part Two. Here R.V. explores episodes that were deliberately misrepresented by Augustus as political conspiracies, and conversely real conspiracies (the two Julias) whose political realities were hidden by him. In the first category, for example, analysis of the cases of Salvidienus Rufus (pp. 124–46) and Cornelius Gallus (pp. 147–68) illuminates the uncertain position of Octavian during the triumviral and post-Actium years, and his need to effect compromises with his senior partner in the triumvirate, Antony, in the former instance, and with the Senate in the latter. She makes an interesting case for Gallus' downfall being engineered by the Senate, partly as a reprisal for Octavian's denial of *spolia opima* to Licinius Crassus, and partly as a reflection of the Senate's fears about its prerogatives being further undermined in Octavian's new world order, as reflected in the appointment of an equestrian to govern Egypt. In both these cases, she suggests, it was in everyone's interest to represent the downfall of two of Octavian's key allies as political conspiracy.

She also argues that conspiracies had a direct impact upon the way in which Augustus' powers evolved (pp. 355–65), with the trial of Primus followed by the conspiracy of Caepio and Murena in 23 B.C. helping to shape the so-called 'Second Settlement', for example. Furthermore, she raises the interesting prospect that the reorganisation of elections for praetors and consuls made by the *lex Valeria Cornelia* of A.D. 5 was a way of responding to the problems raised by Egnatius Rufus' bid for popular support, by reducing the independence of the *comitia*. Overall, she raises the interesting paradox that opposition to Augustus in the end helped to strengthen his position, as he was adept at suppressing resistance, manipulating images of it for propaganda purposes, and moulding his position in the state in response to his opponents' concerns. This paradox may well be worth further thought, even if one objects to the book's assumptions that Augustus claimed to be *restitutor rei publicae* in a constitutional sense, and that he played a central role in actively formulating propaganda (pp. 119–20), shaping the ways in which literary sources subsequently represented conspiracies against him.

University of Warwick

ALISON E. COOLEY  
a.cooley@warwick.ac.uk

## DISPOSAL OF CORPSES

HINARD (F.), DUMONT (J.C.) (edd.) *Libitina. Pompes funèbres et supplices en Campanie à l'époque d'Auguste. Édition, traduction et commentaire de la Lex Libitinae Puteolana*. Pp. x + 175, ills, pls. Paris: De Boccard, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 2-7018-0156-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X05000892

The so-called *Lex Libitinae Puteolana* was first published in 1966 by L. Bove (*RAAN*,

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved

41, 207–39 and *Labeo* 13.1, 1967, 22–48) and, in spite of its enormous interest due to its linguistic and historical content, it has never been thoroughly commented upon. The present collective work constitutes a significant improvement, but it is by no means the final word on this precious document, at least as far as its historical significance is concerned. The book is composed of a very detailed description of the stone (although the reader will have to consult the *editio princeps* or the *Année épigraphique* 1971, no. 88, to find information relating to the circumstances of its discovery, and to its archaeological context), a diplomatic rendering of the text, a critical edition with a translation of the well-preserved parts (including some of the restored text!), and a two-part commentary divided into six short monographic discussions of linguistic, topographic, historical, economic, managerial and legal/procedural issues, followed by an extensive linear commentary on the text. Four drawings in the text (pp. 1, 5–7) and six plates provide a welcome visual aid that is sufficient to give a general idea of the remaining parts of the overall inscription, but somewhat inadequate to allow difficult readings to be checked (the details of Pl. 5 and 6 underline the fact that other parts of the inscription would have benefited from similar reproductions).

The text consists of a job description for the performance of corpse disposal in the colony of Puteoli. The undertaker (*manceps*), acting on behalf of an associate (*socius*) or, at times (i.e. 2.16, 18, 24, 28, 3.17, 22, and possibly 3.1 and 3), of ‘the one whom the case in point may concern’ (‘isve ad q(uem) e(a) r(es) q(ua) d(e) a(gitur) p(ertinet)’), probably a kind of business manager or *institor* (p. 67, n. 80), is shown contracting with the colony, probably through an unspecified magistrate, to be entrusted with the responsibility of hiring morticians and organising their work to rid the territory of corpses that may otherwise be left unburied. The document details the many obligations and rights of the entrepreneur, the make-up of his staff, the procedure to be followed in terms of access to services, with priority given to decurions, to children, and to those who committed suicide by hanging, compensation to be paid for dereliction of duty, arbitration in cases of litigation against competitors who – lawfully or not – broke the monopolistic nature of the public contract, and the enforcement of judiciary decisions through the collection of fines based on pledge-taking. The mere length of the text ensures that light will be shed on various aspects of more or less familiar areas of ancient legal and business practices. Noteworthy is the fact that two provisions (2.8–10 and 11–14) concern the application of the death-penalty, by crucifixion, of private slaves on behalf of their paying masters, and of convicted criminals. Here the executioner is called *redemptor*, indicating perhaps that these lines are borrowed from a separate *lex contractus* (p. 59, n. 18, though timidly), patched together with the rest of the text at a time when the company was obviously expanding and diversifying its activities. Incidentally, these lines could provide the earliest extant evidence for public control over the exercise of the *ius vitae necisque* by private slave owners (cf. B. Bonfiglio, *Index* 24, 1996, 311), perhaps with Spartacus’ revolt in the background.

Dating the inscription has been a controversial matter. While earlier editors and commentators have suggested a date as early as the time of Sulla (e.g. J.P. Bodel, in *AJAH* 11, 1986 [1994] 74–6) on the basis of the language of the text, D. Conso provides a detailed analysis of all linguistic oddities owed either to the original author/editor of the *lex* or to its rendering by the stonecutter. The prudent conclusion that the spelling and the grammatical/lexical usages attested in the text are not inconsistent with an Augustan date should be regarded as not entirely free of *parti pris* (32, 33, 35, etc.; cf. N. Belayche, in the next chapter, pp. 49–52, on the basis of

topographical details, inconclusive as well). As a matter of fact, the inscription makes sense, in form and content, at any time during the first century B.C. The administrative and social problem it aims at solving is indeed timeless, and the solutions were probably not so numerous and diverse that a precise dating turns out to be crucial for our understanding of the text. What is most striking is that in spite of the ubiquity and recurrence of the question of corpse disposal in the ancient world, there seems to be no other evidence of the kind, except for some fragments of a comparable inscription from nearby Cumae, well known to the authors, but unfortunately not the object of a new publication, translation, and commentary in the same volume. The reader may wish that the impressive scholarship displayed in each chapter would develop into a fully-fledged discussion of the broader issues raised by the quasi uniqueness of the document under investigation.

The volume has its strong points. To mention but one example, Ph. Moreau's step-by-step description of the procedure implied by the *lex contractus* is a feat in itself, if only from a methodological point of view. Such an approach could be advantageously applied to other, larger collections of evidence, such as the first-century A.D. tablets from Agro Murecine. Overall, the volume will facilitate the use of this fascinating material, and will serve as a starting point for those interested in business management, city administration and public policy. The Editors must be commended for providing a reliable edition of the text and fostering further debate on a wide range of questions.

Université de Neuchâtel (Switzerland)

JEAN-JACQUES AUBERT  
jean-jacques.aubert@unine.ch

## IDEOLOGY IN THE PROVINCES

ANDO (C.) *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Pp. xxi + 494. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2000. Cased, £38. ISBN 0-520-22067-6.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X05000909

This is a strange book. Its intellectual pedigree is in bloodstock terms by Fergus Millar out of Pierre Bourdieu: hunting *habitus* in the filing cabinet. It is about as much fun to read as that sounds.

First it should be said that this is a work of considerable scholarship. Every student of the Roman empire will find something of interest in it. For example this reviewer found the section on the mutable symbolism of Roman army standards (pp. 259–69) thought-provoking. But it does not follow that the whole works as a book.

A. sets out with a bunch of questions (pp. xi–xiii). Why did the empire last so long? Why was Rome so stable? Why did the provincials romanise? Why did patriotism for the empire appear? For A. the answers are that Rome relentlessly justified herself to her subjects; appealing for, and getting government by, consensus. There are methodological problems with both sides of the equation. That Rome was stable, that provincials romanised, and that patriotism emerged are questionable presuppositions that need demonstrating rather than self-evident givens. A. is right to take seriously Roman 'propaganda' (a slippery concept A. never really nails down). But it does not follow that all contemporaries took it seriously, let alone that they all bought into its message. A. creates a world much like that of Paul Zanker in *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Eng. tr., Ann Arbor, 1988) where everyone internalises imperial

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved